



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Mr. Krueger to propose an Examiner's Amendment for claim 75. Mr. Krueger called Mr. Babineau who also participated in the interview. The Examiner indicated that the term "overhand" in the eighth line must be changed to --overhang--. The Examiner also indicated that the references of Lauer and Burnett et al. still could be used to reject the claims because the claim only recites the intended use limitation "for receiving an upper edge of a mating fastener element" but the claims does not recite that the mating fastener has to be an identical mating fastener and therefore any fastener or object that can be received in the wells will meet the claim limitation. The Examiner indicated that the limitation "the engageable sides of the majority of the elements are oriented in a common direction and overhang the sheet-form base" could make the claim allowable if criticality of the overhang is included in the claim since Lauer and Burnett fail to disclose an overhang. After some discussion, Mr. Babineau proposed adding the limitation "to resist separation of a mating fastener element" as a way to make more clear the intended purpose of the overhang of the engageable side. Both parties agreed with this change and the Examiner agreed to make this change through an Examiner's amendment in order to place the application in condition for allowance.